1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 DARRELL W. WHEELER, et al. 11 12 Plaintiff(s), No. C 09-1826 BZ 13 BRIEFING ORDER v. 14 HILO MEDICAL CENTER, et al.,) 15 Defendant(s). 16 17 Having received motions to dismiss plaintiffs' first 18 amended complaint from defendants Robert White, Hilo Medical Center, Inc., LitNeutral LLC, and Queens Medical Center, IT IS 19 2.0 **HEREBY ORDERED** as follows: 21 Plaintiffs' opposition to the respective motions 22 shall be filed by August 5, 2009; and 23 2. Defendants' replies, if any, shall be filed by 24 August 19, 2009; 25 3. A hearing is scheduled for September 23, 2009 at

1

10:00 a.m. in Courtroom G, on 15th Floor of the Federal

Building, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California

26

27

28

94102.

1	Plaintiffs are advised that they have the burden of
2	producing admissible evidence which, if believed, would be
3	sufficient to establish the existence of personal jurisdiction
4	over the defendants. <i>See</i> <u>Ballard v. Savage</u> , 65 F.3d 1495,
5	1498 (9th Cir. 1995); see also <u>Doe, I v. Unocal Corp.</u> , 248
6	F.3d 915, 922 (9th Cir. 2001) (per curiam). If plaintiffs do
7	not meet their burden of showing that jurisdiction exists,
8	defendants' motions will be granted and the complaint will be
9	dismissed, at least as to these defendants. See Harris Rutsky
10	& Co. Ins. Servs. v. Bell & Clements Ltd., 328 F.3d 1122, 1129
11	(9th Cir. 2003); <u>Pacific Atlantic Trading Co. v. M/V Main</u>
12	<u>Exp.</u> , 758 F.2d 1325, 1327 (9th Cir. 1985); <u>Data Disc, Inc. v.</u>
13	Systems Technology Assoc., 557 F.2d 1280, 1285 (9th Cir.
14	1977).
15	Dated: July 21, 2009
16	L'emara Jimmeman
17	Bernard/Zimmerman United States Magistrate Judge
18	
19	G:\BZALL\-BZCASES\WHEELER\BRIEFING ORDER.wpd